

REMARKS

At the outset, the Applicants thank Examiner Contino for thoroughly reviewing the pending application. In addition, the Applicants would like to thank Examiner Contino for making the trip from Boston to Virginia to hold an in-person interview with the Applicants' representatives at the Patent Office on November 14, 2008.

In the present application claims 1-8, 13-19, 21-28 and 30-44 have been cancelled. Claims 9-10, 20 and 29 have been amended and new claims 45-57 have been added. Accordingly, claims 9-12, 20, 29 and 45-57 are pending in the present application.

As stated, on November 14, 2008, the Applicants' representatives conducted an in-person interview with the Examiner at the Patent Office. During the interview, the Examiner and the Applicants' representatives agreed that the claim features set forth in the Interview Summary sheet overcome the cited references, including the 3GPP standards and the WCDMA reference. For convenience, a copy of the Interview Summary sheet is submitted herewith. As each of the currently pending claims now include these features, they are patentably distinguishable over the aforementioned and other cited references, as discussed herein below.

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, claims 9-12, 18-20, 35-40 and 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by WCDMA for UMTS: Radio Access for third Generation Mobile Communications in conjunction with 3GPP TS 25.322 V4.4.0 (2002-03). With respect to claims 18-19, 35-40 and 42-44, the rejection is now moot as these claims have been cancelled. With respect to claims **9-12 and 20**, the above-identified amendments overcome the present rejection as agreed upon during the November 14, 2008 Examiner interview. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the present rejection of amended claims 9-12 and 20.

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over CarTALK (Communication Architecture Deliverable D6) in view of 3GPP and further in view of US Pub. No. 2003/0211846 (Nagpal et al.). Claim **29** was amended, as agreed upon during the November 14, 2008 Examiner interview. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the present rejection of amended claim 29.

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). However, claim 41 was cancelled. Therefore, the present rejection is now moot.


As mentioned above, and as shown in the Listing of Claims, new claims **45-57** have been added. Each of these claims, as stated, comprise the same or similar claim language discussed during the Examiner interview, and are likewise patentable over the cited prior references.

The application is in condition for allowance. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7513 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: December 24, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

 (Reg. No. 42,766)

Mark R. Kresloff

Registration No.: 42,766

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.


Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/816,247

03/31/2004

Seung June Yi

2101-3059

9122

35884 7590 11/18/2008
LEE, HONG, DEGERMAN, KANG & WAIMEY
660 S. FIGUEROA STREET
Suite 2300
LOS ANGELES, CA 90017

EXAMINER

CONTINO, PAUL F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2114

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/18/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

COPY



Interview Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/816,247	YI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
PAUL F. CONTINO	2114	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Paul F. Contino (Examiner). (3) Sun Ju Lim (inventor).
(2) Mark Kresloff (Reg. No. 42,766). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 14 November 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: All.

COPY

Identification of prior art discussed: 3GPP/WCDMA standard.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner and the Applicant came to an understanding that (1) the inclusion in the claims of a step for determining whether a predetermined procedure was set and, (2) determining of the configuration of preset values associated with the set predetermined procedure in the invention as claimed differentiate the invention from the presently applied prior art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Paul F. Contino/

14 November 2008